

490

SPECIAL JOINT MEETING OF THE
LODI CITY COUNCIL AND THE
LODI PLANNING COMMISSION
CARNEGIE FORUM
305 WEST PINE STREET
LODI, CALIFORNIA
WEDNESDAY, JULY 31, 1991
7:30 P.M.

The Special Joint Meeting of the Lodi City Council and the Lodi Planning Commission held Wednesday, July 31, 1991 at 7:30 p.m. was called to order by Mayor David Hinchman.

City Clerk Reimche recorded the roll as follows:

Present: Council Members - Pennino, Pinkerton, Sieglock,
Snider, and Hinchman (Mayor)

Absent: Council Members - None

Present: Planning Commissioners: Griffith, Lapenta,
Marzolf, Mindt,
Rasmussen, Stafford and
Hitchcock

Absent: Planning Commissioners: None

Also Present: City Manager Peterson, Assistant City
Manager Glenn, Community Development
Director Schroeder, Public Works Director
Ronsko, City Attorney McNatt, and City Clerk
Reimche

LODI GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLAN

CC-35(b) Notice thereof having been published according to law, an affidavit of which publication is on file in the City Clerk's office, Mayor Hinchman called for the public hearing to consider the City of Lodi Growth Management Plan.

Following introduction of the matter by City Manager Peterson, Community Development Director Schroeder reported that the Planning Commission and the Public Works and Community Development Departments have jointly developed the following Evaluation Criteria Development Plan and Priority Development Areas.

The Evaluation Criteria was originally prepared by the Mayor's Task Force on Measure "A" and has been revised for the City's current needs.

The Development Plan was prepared by the Community Development Department and reviewed and revised by City staff and the Planning Commission.

The Priority Development Areas was prepared by the Public Works Department and reflects the location of existing City utility systems.

These three items have been recommended to the City Council as the basis for the Growth Management System as described in the Policy Document of the General Plan adopted by the City Council on June 12, 1991.

This material was previously presented to the City Council at a Shirtsleeve Session. At that time the material was in a preliminary form; however, it has not been greatly changed since that presentation.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT - DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Development Plan - Required. An application for Growth Management Review shall be made to the Planning Commission on forms provided by the Community Development and shall include and be accompanied by a Development Plan.

Development Plan - Contents. The development plan shall include:

1. A map showing any street system and/or lot design proposed within the development. Any area proposed to be dedicated or reserved for parks, open-space conservation, playgrounds, school sites, public buildings, churches and other such uses must be shown. Compliance with this requirement shall not be construed to relieve the applicant from compliance with City and State Subdivision regulations or any other applicable local or state laws;
2. A map showing the location of all trees over nine (9) inches in diameter with an indication of removal or incorporation into project design;
3. If required by the Community Development Department, a map showing the topography of the proposed development at one-foot intervals must be provided by the applicant;
4. The applicant shall provide a land-use plan for the proposed development indicating the areas to be used for the various purposes; and land-use map showing existing uses

- within the development and uses within five hundred feet of the proposed development;
5. A plot plan for each building site or sites, except single-family residents on standard lots in the proposed development or any other portion thereof as required by the Community Development Department. A plot plan shall show the approximate location of all proposed buildings, indicate maximum and minimum distances between buildings and between buildings and property or building site lines;
 6. Any or all of the following plans and diagrams may also be required to be included on the plot plan or appended thereto:
 - a) Off-street parking and loading plan.
 - b) A circulation diagram indicating the proposed movement of vehicles, goods and pedestrians within the development and to and from adjacent public thoroughfares.
 7. Elevations or perspective drawings of all proposed structures, except single-family residences and their accessory buildings. Such drawings need not be the result of final architectural decisions and need not be in detail. The purpose of such drawings is to indicate within stated limits the height of proposed buildings and the general appearance of the proposed structures to the end that the entire development will have architectural unity and be in harmony with the surrounding developments;
 8. Engineering data as described in the City of Lodi Public Improvements Design Standards.

Development Schedule

1. An application shall be accompanied by a development schedule indicating to the best of the applicant's knowledge the approximate date when construction of the project can be expected to begin, the anticipated rate of development and the completion date. The development schedule, if approved, shall become a part of the development plan and shall be adhered to by the owner or owners of the property and his successors in

- interest. The City may require posting of a performance guarantee by the applicant to ensure construction in accordance with the development plan and within the development schedule.
2. From time to time the Planning Commission shall compare the actual development accomplished with the approved development schedules.
 3. If, in the opinion of the Planning Commission, the owner or owners of property are failing or have failed to meet the approved schedule, the Planning Commission may initiate proceedings to amend or revoke the approval of the development plan.
 4. If the Tentative Subdivision Map is not filed one year after approved, the Planning Commission may forfeit the approved allocations to the next project on the list.
 5. If the Planning Commission determines that a proposed Development Plan will require multi-year allocation to complete, each year of the development schedule shall be approved for a stated number and type of residential units.
 6. Tentative Subdivision Maps will be accepted until the Planning Commission has approved the Development Plan and Development Schedule and allocated the number of units either on a single-year or multi-year basis.
 7. In the event that an approved Development Plan is amended to the point that it conflicts with the original proposal, it must go through the allocation process again.

Evaluation Criteria

(The criteria listed below have been developed to be consistent with current City policies and State laws.)

A.	<u>Agricultural Land Conflicts</u>	<u>Score</u>
	1. Project does not require conversion of vacant agricultural land	10

2. Project is adjacent to agricultural land on one side 7
3. Project is adjacent to agricultural land on two sides 5
4. Project is adjacent to agricultural land on three sides 3
5. Project is surrounded by agricultural land 0

B. Onsite Agricultural Land Mitigation

1. Project needs no agricultural land mitigation 10
2. Adequate onsite buffer has been provided as a part of site layout for all adjacent agricultural land 7
3. Onsite buffer provided as a part of site layout for only part of the project 5
4. No buffer between project and adjacent agricultural land 0

C. General Location (see map attached marked Exhibit A)

1. Project located within Priority Area 1 200
2. Project located within Priority Area 2 100
3. Project located within Priority Area 3 0

D. Relationship to Public Services

1. General Location
 - a) Project abuts existing development on four sides 10
 - b) Project abuts existing development on three sides 7

- c) Project abuts existing development on two sides 5
- d) Project abuts existing development on one side 3
- e) Project is surrounded by undeveloped land 0

2. Wastewater

- a) Project is located adjacent to existing Master Plan sanitary sewers or mains designed to serve the project 10
- b) Project will extend a Master Plan line within its boundaries 8
- c) Project will extend a Master Plan line outside of its boundaries but within existing right-of-way (0 if right-of-way is necessary) 4
- d) Project requires construction of a new lift station for which funds are available in the Sewer Impact Fee Fund 0
- e) Project requires construction of a new lift station for which funds are not available in the Sewer Impact Fee Fund *

3. Water

- a) Project is located adjacent to existing Master Plan water mains or mains designed to serve the project 10
- b) Project will extend Master Plan lines within its boundaries 8
- c) Project will extend Master Plan lines outside 4

its boundaries, but within
existing right-of-way
(0 if outside right-of-way)

- d) Project requires construction of a new water well for which funds are available in the water impact fee fund 0
- e) Project requires construction of a new water well for which funds are not available in the water impact fee fund *
- f) Project improves the existing system (i.e., eliminates dead-ends, loops Master Plan lines, provides a well site) +1 to 3

4. Drainage

- a) Project is served by an existing drainage basin and Master Plan line or mains designed to serve the project 10
- b) Project will extend a Master Plan line or expand an existing basin within its boundaries 8
- c) Project will extend a Master Plan line or expand an existing basin outside of its boundaries but within existing rights-of-way (0 points if right-of-way is necessary) 4
- d) Project requires construction of a new basin for which funds are available in the Master Drainage Impact Fee Fund 0

its boundaries, but within
existing right-of-way
(0 if outside right-of-way)

- d) Project requires construction of a new water well for which funds are available in the water impact fee fund 0
- e) Project requires construction of a new water well for which funds are not available in the water impact fee fund *
- f) Project improves the existing system (i.e., eliminates dead-ends, loops Master Plan lines, provides a well site) +1 to 3

4. Drainage

- a) Project is served by an existing drainage basin and Master Plan line or mains designed to serve the project 10
- b) Project will extend a Master Plan line or expand an existing basin within its boundaries 8
- c) Project will extend a Master Plan line or expand an existing basin outside of its boundaries but within existing rights-of-way (0 points if right-of-way is necessary) 4
- d) Project requires construction of a new basin for which funds are available in the Master Drainage Impact Fee Fund 0

*Approved
Deputy City Clerk*

- e) Project requires construction of a new basin for which funds are not available in the Drainage Impact Fee Fund *

E. Promotion of Open Space

Points shall be awarded on the basis of the percentage of coverage of the total loss of project area by roof area and paved areas onsite (exclusive of streets).

20% or less	10 points
30% or less	8 points
40% or less	6 points
50%	4 points
60%	2 points
70% or greater	0 points

Project owner shall submit an analysis of the percentage of impervious surface of the site.

F. Traffic

1. Project widens or improves an existing facility 10
2. Project will extend Master Plan streets within its boundaries 8
3. Project will extend Master Plan streets outside its boundaries, but within existing right-of-way (0 if outside right-of-way) 4
4. Project requires roadway improvements for which funds are available in the Street Impact Fee Program 0
5. Project required roadway improvements for which funds are not available in the Street Impact Fee Program *

6. Project improves circulation by providing additional access to adjacent development (including non-vehicular access) +1 to 5

G. Housing

1. Low and Moderate Income Housing. A point credit will be awarded with the following schedule:

25% or more of units low and moderate	10
20%-24%	8
15%-19%	6
10%-14%	4
5%-9%	2
Less than 5% low and moderate or low and moderate housing proposed	0

*Indicates project cannot proceed without provision for construction of the appropriate facility.

H. Site Plan and Project Design--Bonus Points (These criteria shall only apply to multi-family projects.)

1. Landscaping. (Planning Commission shall evaluate and provide between 10 and 0 points.) (These criteria shall only apply to multi-family projects.)
2. Architectural Design. (SPARC Committee shall evaluate and provide between 10 and 0 points.) (These criteria shall only apply to multi-family projects.)

Section I Schools has been added by the Community Development Department to the Task Force Recommendations to address the problem of school impaction in Lodi. Recent court decisions have stated that local governments have the power to consider the availability of school facilities when reviewing development projects.

I. Schools

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1. | Project is within 1/4 mile of an existing (or proposed) elementary school | 10 |
| 2. | Project is within 1/2 mile of an existing (or proposed) elementary school | 5 |
| 3. | Project is more than 1/2 mile from an existing (or proposed) elementary school | 0 |
| 4. | Project is within 1/2 mile of an existing (or proposed) middle school | 10 |
| 5. | Project is within 1 mile of an existing (or proposed) middle school | 5 |
| 6. | Project is more than 1 mile of an existing (or proposed) middle school | 0 |
| 7. | Project is within 1 mile of an existing (or proposed) high school | 10 |
| 8. | Project is within 2 miles of an existing (or proposed) high school | 5 |

A lengthy discussion followed with questions being delivered to staff.

The following persons addressed the Council regarding the matter:

- a) Janet Pruss, 2421 Diablo Drive, Lodi;
- b) Ben Schaffer, 207 Riveroaks Drive, Lodi; and
- c) Ron Thomas, 1209 West Tokay Street, Lodi.

There being no other persons in the audience wishing to speak on the matter the public portion of the hearing was closed.

On motion of Mayor Hinchman, Sieglock second, the City Council directed that the proposed ordinance entitled, "An Ordinance of the Lodi City Council to Provide for Controlled Residential Growth in the City of Lodi" will be

the topic of discussion for the Shirtsleeve Session of August 27, 1991.

PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS AND
ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS APPROVED
FOR TRAFFIC SIGNAL AND LIGHTING
INSTALLATIONS AT KETTLEMAN LANE/MILLS
AVENUE, HUTCHINS STREET/VINE STREET,
CHURCH STREET/WALNUT STREET, CHURCH
STREET/OAK STREET, CHURCH STREET/PINE
STREET AND CHURCH STREET/ELM STREET

CC-12.1(c) On motion of Council Member Snider, Pennino second, the City Council approved the plans and specifications and advertisement for bids for traffic signal and lighting installations at Kettleman Lane/Mills Avenue, Hutchins Street/Vine Street, Church Street/Walnut Street, Church Street/Oak Street, Church Street/Pine Street and Church Street/Elm Street.


The City Council was advised that this project includes the installation of traffic signals at the intersections of Kettleman Lane/Mills Avenue and Hutchins Street/Vine Street. The intersection of Church Street and Pine Street will be modified so that it is fully actuated and the intersections of Church Street/Walnut Street, Oak Street and Elm Street will be modified with side street actuation.

This project was the one discussed earlier in 1991 with regard to possibly "selling" our FAU funds and avoiding the new State deadlines for use of FAU funds. Council elected to do the signal projects and the City retained a Consultant to prepare plans and specifications. The Caltrans review process was long, difficult and frustrating. We have met the necessary State deadlines but need to proceed on the project before the Federal fiscal year ends at the end of September. The project will utilize the City's remaining Federal Aid Urban balance of approximately \$206,000. With this plus an additional \$52,000 already budgeted, we are still \$47,000 short to do the project. A recommendation for an additional appropriation will be made at the time of award.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion to come before the City Council, the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Attest:


Alice M. Reimche
City Clerk



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREAS

